



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,450	08/29/2001	Jeff S. Eder	AR - 23	5509
53787	7590	08/11/2008		
ASSET TRUST, INC. 2020 MALTBY ROAD SUITE 7362 BOTHELL, WA 98021			EXAMINER LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/940,450

**Applicant(s)**

EDER, JEFF S.

**Examiner**

JENNIFER LIVERSEGE

**Art Unit**

3692

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-52, 62-64, 68-70, 90, 91 and 134-167 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-52, 62-64, 68-70, 90, 91 and 134-167 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/23/2004, 9/1/2004, 9/7/2004, 9/13/2004, 1/7/2005, 5/10/2005, 9/2/2006, 9/3/2006  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration of application 09/940,450, by means of an amendment after non-final final filed September 1, 2006; Appeal Briefs filed October 22, 2006, May 10, 2007, July 11, 2007 and September 8, 2007; and Supplemental Appeal Briefs filed October 12, 2007 and July 28, 2008.

In view of the amendment after non-final, Appeal Briefs, and Supplemental Appeal Briefs filed as noted above, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Kambiz Abdi/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3692.

This application has been transferred and is now being handled by Jennifer Liversedge, the Examiner as has signed the present Office Action below. Further inquiry and responses may be directed accordingly.

The claims as presented in the amendment after non-final will be examined for this Office Action.

The amendment contains previously presented claims: 34-40, 42, 44-50, 52, 63-64 and 69-70.

The amendment contains amended claims: 41, 43, 51, 62, 68, 90-91 and 134.

The amendment contains new claims: 135-167.

Claims 1-33, 53-61, 65-67, 71-89 and 92-133 have been canceled.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements (IDS's) submitted on April 23, 2004, September 1, 2004, September 7, 2004, September 13, 2004, January 7, 2005, May 10, 2005, September 2, 2006 and September 3, 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

It is noted that in the amendment and remarks, a request was made for initialed copies of previously provided IDS's be provided to applicant. Examiner believes that each IDS is within initialed and enclosed.

Examiner also notes that it is not possible to read the entirety of multiple books as part of the IDS consideration. Because of the voluminous nature of some of the references cited on the IDS, a cursory review of those references was provided.

Several NPL references submitted in the IDS on January 7, 2005 could not be located and therefore were not considered. One NPL reference submitted on September 2, 2008 could not be found and therefore was not considered. Examiner also referenced application 90/421,553 from which the present application claims priority, however, the NPL documents were not located in that file either. Additionally, one reference on the IDS submitted September 2, 2006 was not considered as the document number and applicant did not match.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 155 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is believed that line 5 is intended to read "...in accordance *with* xml..." rather than "in accordance xml". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 44-51, 145-149 and 159-163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claims 44, 145 and 159 are directed to methods claims, however, the steps as recited

do not result in a concrete, tangible and useful output. The steps, rather, speak to data manipulation and integration without a real-world output.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 34-39, 42-47, 50-52, 135-138, 141-143, 145, 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 7,249,328 B1 to Davis (further referred to as Davis).

Regarding claim 34, Davis discloses a computer readable medium having sequences of instructions stored therein, which when executed cause the processor in a computer to perform a data preparation method, comprising:

Integrating data from a variety of systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

using xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column

13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65).

Regarding claim 44, Davis discloses a data preparation method, comprising:

Integrating data from a variety of systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

using xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65).



Regarding claim 52, Davis discloses a computer readable medium having sequences of instructions stored therein, which when executed cause the processors in a plurality of computers connected via a network (column 12, lines 57-66) to perform the data preparation method of claim 44 (see rejection for claim 44).

Regarding claim 135, Davis discloses a data preparation system, comprising:

A computer with a processor having circuitry to execute instructions;

A storage device available to said processor with sequences of instructions stored therein, which when executed cause the processor to:

Integrate a plurality of data from a plurality of organization related systems and an Internet (column 8, lines 29-46; column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 25-26 and lines 38-45; column 11, lines 24-27 and 53-62; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-39; column 38, lines 50-53)

Using xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56), and

Store said data in an application database for use in processing where an application database further comprises a central database that makes the data accessible and available for extraction and analysis so as to provide a coherent view of

the data for an enterprise (Figures 2 and 3; column 8, line 65 – column 7, line 10; column 13, line 61 – column 14, line 67; column 16, lines 11-15; column 17, line 35 – column 18, line 6; column 20, lines 4-8).

Regarding claim 141, Davis discloses a program storage device readable by machine, tangible embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform the method steps in a data processing method, comprising:

Using metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate a plurality of data from a plurality of systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 145, Davis discloses a data method, comprising:

Using metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate a plurality of data from a plurality of enterprise related systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50;

column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65).

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 35, Davis discloses where the common schema includes an organization designation (column 8, lines 37-40; column 10, lines 25-30; column 11, lines 52-62; column 33, lines 31-47; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 37, Davis discloses where the common schema includes a data structure (column 8, lines 28-54; column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-62; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 33, lines 31-47; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 38, Davis discloses where the data structure is a hierarchy (column 21, lines 46-59; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-57; column 31, lines 5-7).

Regarding claims 39 and 47, Davis discloses where the common schema includes a data dictionary (column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59; column 30, lines 51-57; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 45, Davis discloses where the common schema includes an organization designation and data structure (column 8, lines 28-54; column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-62; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 33, lines 31-47; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 137, Davis discloses where a common schema includes attributes selected from the group consisting of organization designation, data structure, metadata standard, data dictionary and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 37-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 25-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claims 36, 46 and 138, Davis discloses wherein the designated organization is a single product, a group of products, a division, a company, a multi-company corporation or a value chain (column 8, lines 37-40; column 10, lines 25-30; column 11, lines 52-62; column 33, lines 31-47; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claims 42 and 50, Davis discloses wherein at least a portion of the data are from the Internet or an external database (column 8, lines 24-34; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-31).

Regarding claim 43, Davis discloses where the data preparation method further comprises converting data to match a common schema and storing the converted data in a central database (column 11, lines 15-67; column 12, lines 26-56; column 27, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 51 and 143, Davis discloses where the data preparation method further comprises converting and storing data in accordance with the common schema (column 11, lines 15-67; column 12, lines 26-56; column 27, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 136, Davis discloses using metadata mapping to convert and store data in accordance with a common schema (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20,

Art Unit: 3692

lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47;  
column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49).

Regarding claims 142, Davis discloses wherein at least some data are pre-specified for integration (column 10, lines 25-30; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59).

Regarding claim 149, Davis discloses wherein the data method further comprises storing a plurality of converted data in one or more tables to support organization processing (column 11, lines 15-67; column 12, lines 26-56; column 27, lines 1-6).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 62-63, 68, 70, 90, 134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, in view of "How to sort out the premium drivers of post-deal value) by Daniel Bielinski (further referred to as Bielinski), and further in view of US Patent 6,018,722 to Ray et al. (further referred to as Ray).

Regarding claim 62, Davis discloses a computer readable medium having sequences of instructions stored therein, which when executed cause the processor in a plurality of computers that have been connected via a network to perform an organization management method, comprising:

Integrating a plurality of organization related data from a variety of sources (column 8, lines 29-46; column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 25-26 and lines 38-45; column 11, lines 24-27 and 53-62; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-39; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56),

Using at least a portion of said data to create one or more tools for organization management and making the one or more tools available for review (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17;



column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65),

Where the one or more tools for organization management further comprise tools selected from the group consisting of analytical models, category of value models, component of value models, market value models, network models, management reports, and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 36-46; column 10, lines 38-53; column 11, lines 52-55; column 28, lines 31-39; column 33, lines 15-47; column 36, lines 59-67; column 38, lines 48-65; column 44, lines 22-34; column 45, lines 1-63; column 46, lines 27-38).

Davis does not disclose where tools are selected from the group consisting of optimization models, simulation models, value chains models, lists of changes that will optimize one or more aspects of organization financial performance. However, Bielinski discloses where the tools are selected from the group consisting of optimization models, simulation models, value chains models, lists of changes that will optimize one or more aspects of organization financial performance (page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2; page 2, paragraphs 1, 6 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 1 and 2; page 4, paragraphs 1, 8 and 10; page 5, paragraphs 1-4).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of tools such as analytical models, management summary reports, etc. as disclosed by Davis to adapt the use of tools such as optimization models and lists of changes optimizing organization financial performance, etc. as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the tools described by Davis and Bielinski are useful

for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, it would further be obvious to provide evaluation tools as are known to be part of a group in the art.

Neither Davis nor Bielinski disclose where one or more of the tools comprise a system for automated trading of organization equity. However, Ray discloses a system for automated trading of organization equity (at least abstract). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the use of Internets and Intranets for interacting and evaluating financial data as disclosed by the combination of Davis and Bielinski to incorporate a system for automated trading of equity as disclosed by Ray. The motivation would be that Davis and Bielinski provide for a fully interactive system and method using the Internet and wherein a user uses financial data from a plurality of sources in order to use charts, graphs, spreadsheets, etc. in order to view, manipulate, compare and manage the financial data such that evaluations and conclusions can be drawn regarding the data and providing an automated trading tool enables a user to do something with the results of their analysis without going to a trading website to perform a trade. It would therefore be obvious to provide a system for automated trading as disclosed by Ray based the collection of data and based on a financial evaluation as is performed by the system and method of Davis and Bielinski.

Regarding claim 63, Davis discloses where the one or more tools are made available for review using an electronic display, a paper document or combinations thereof (column 4, lines 33-45).

Regarding claim 68, Davis discloses where the common schema defines common attributes selected from the group consisting of data structure, organization designation, data dictionary and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 28-54; column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-62; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59; column 30, lines 51-57; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 31-47; column 46, lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 70, Davis discloses where the data structure is a hierarchy (column 21, lines 46-59; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-57; column 31, lines 5-7).

Regarding claim 90, Davis discloses wherein the one or more aspects of organization financial performance are selected from the group consisting of organization revenue, organization expense organizational capital change and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 36-46; column 9, lines 59-65; column 10, lines 38-53; column 11, lines 53-62; column 13, lines 20-30; column 28, lines 36-39; column 32, lines 27-67; column 33, lines 15-47; column 39, line 61 – column 40, line 50; column 45, lines 1-14; column 45, lines 35-50).

Davis does not disclose where financial performance is selected from the group consisting of organization current operation value, organization real option value, organization market sentiment value and organization market value. However, Bielinski discloses where financial performance is selected from the group consisting of organization current operation value, organization real option value and organization market value (page 1, paragraphs 1-2; page 2, paragraphs 1 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 1 and 2; page 4, paragraphs 5, 8 and 10).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of tools such as performance aspects as revenue and expenses as disclosed by Davis to adapt the use performance aspects such as real option value and market value, etc. as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the tools described by Davis and Bielinski are useful for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, it would further be obvious to provide evaluation tools as are known to be part of a group in the art.

Neither Davis nor Bielinski specifically disclose market sentiment. However, Ray discloses a trading system where stock price is based on the public's perception and sentiment towards the company as reflected in the stock price (at least abstract; column 2, lines 19-48; column 3, lines 19-22). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to modify the use of performance aspects including Revenue, expenses, real options value as disclosed by Davis and Bielinski to adapt the performance aspect of market sentiment as disclosed by Ray. The motivation would be that each of the mentioned indicators are used for measuring, comparing, and evaluating a company's financial performance.

Regarding claim 134, Davis discloses the use of relative importance of the different elements of value, categories of value and enterprises in determining organization financial performance as required to support the development of one or more tools for organization management (column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 46-59; column 24, lines 15-24; column 25, lines 53-63; column 26, lines 47-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-42; column 29, lines 39-56; column 30, lines 51-60; column 31, lines 5-7 and lines 26-51).

Neither Davis nor Bielinski disclose where this is learned. However, Ray discloses where this is learned (column 8, lines 23-38). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the retrieving, gathering, and calculations with values of financial performance with relative importance as disclosed by the combination of Davis and Bielinski to adapt the learning of the importance as disclosed by Ray. The motivation would be that Davis and Bielinski provide for the measurement and determination of financial performance using financial data and using such techniques as metadata and simulation for making such an evaluation. Providing a neural network

enhances the ability of the system to learn and think as a human would think in terms of the data, and the interpretations made thereof.

Claims 40-41, 48-49, 139-140, 146, 150-151 and 154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claims 40, 48 and 139, Davis discloses where the data dictionary defines standard data attributes from the group consisting of components of value, currencies, elements of value, units of measure and time periods (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67).

Davis does not disclose where the data dictionary defines data attributes for account numbers. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known that account numbers are one way of identifying an account and that accounts and account numbers are used in database management and as a way of storing and organizing data and it would be obvious therefore to include account numbers in the data dictionary. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that data could be from any types of indicators as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claims 41 and 49, Davis discloses where data are obtained from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Davis does not disclose data are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that data could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 140, Davis discloses wherein a plurality of organization related systems are database management systems for systems selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Davis does not disclose where systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 146, Davis discloses wherein a plurality of systems are selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Davis does not disclose where enterprise related systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of



ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 150, Davis discloses a data preparation system, comprising:

A computer with a processor having circuitry to execute instructions (Figure 2; column 13, line 61 - column 14, line 67);

A storage device available to said processor with sequences of instructions stored therein (Figure 2; column 13, line 61 – column 14, line 67), which when executed cause the processor to:

Use metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate and convert a plurality of data from a plurality of enterprise related systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50;

column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45), and

Where a plurality of enterprise related systems are selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Davis does not disclose where enterprise related systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claims 151, Davis discloses wherein at least some data are pre-specified for integration (column 10, lines 25-30; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59).

Regarding claim 154, Davis discloses wherein at least a portion of the data are obtained from an Internet or an external database (column 8, lines 24-34; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-31).

Claims 144, 147, 155-157, 159, 161 and 163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, and further in view of US Patent 6,549,922 B1 to Srivastava et al. (further referred to as Srivastava).

Regarding claim 155, Davis discloses a program storage device readable by machine, tangible embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform the method steps in a data processing method, comprising:

Using metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18,

line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate a plurality of data from a plurality of enterprise related systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Davis does not disclose where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table. However, Srivastava discloses where a

metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Regarding claim 159, Davis discloses a data method, comprising:

Using metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65; column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate a plurality of data from a plurality of enterprise related systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50;

column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Davis does not disclose where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table. However, Srivastava discloses where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Regarding claims 144, 147 and 161, Davis discloses wherein a set of integration and conversion rules are saved in a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Davis does not disclose wherein the set of integration and conversion rules are established using a metadata and conversion rules window. However, Srivastava discloses where the set of integration and conversion rules are established using a metadata and conversion rules window (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Regarding claim 156, Davis discloses wherein at least some data are pre-specified for integration and conversion (column 10, lines 25-30; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59).

Regarding claim 157, Davis discloses wherein a plurality of integrated enterprise data are stored in an application database in accordance with a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 15-67; column 12, lines 26-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-6; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56).

Regarding claim 163, Davis discloses wherein the data method further comprises storing a plurality of converted data in one or more tables to support organization processing (column 11, lines 15-67; column 12, lines 26-56; column 27, lines 1-6).

Claims 158, 160 and 164-167 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, in view of US Patent 6,549,922 B1 to Srivastava et al. (further referred to as Srivastava), and further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claims 158 and 160, Davis discloses wherein a plurality of systems are selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-



53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Neither Davis nor Srivastava disclose where enterprise related systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 164, Davis discloses a data preparation system, comprising:

A computer with a processor having circuitry to execute instructions (Figure 2; column 13, line 61 - column 14, line 67);

A storage device available to said processor with sequences of instructions stored therein (Figure 2; column 13, line 61 – column 14, line 67), which when executed cause the processor to:

Use metadata mapping (column 4, lines 17-32; column 10, lines 19-30; column 13, lines 37-40 and lines 45-50; column 15, lines 56-67; column 17, line 66 – column 18, line 9; column 18, lines 48-64; column 19, lines 3-13; column 20, lines 32-38; column

21, lines 56-59; column 31, lines 5-7; column 33, lines 44-47; column 38, lines 48-65;  
column 49, lines 19-50; column 50, lines 38-49)

To integrate and convert a plurality of data from a plurality of enterprise related systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53)

In accordance with xml and a common schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56)

to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45), and

Where a plurality of enterprise related systems are selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems.

Davis does not disclose where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table. However, Srivastava discloses where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Neither Davis nor Srivastava disclose where enterprise related systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, the combination of Davis and Srivastava discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claims 165, Davis discloses wherein at least some data are pre-specified for integration and conversion (column 10, lines 25-30; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59).

Regarding claim 166, Davis discloses where a common schema identifies data designations selected from the group consisting of components of value, sub components of value, elements of value and sub elements of value (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-58; column 44, lines 22-34; column 45, lines 40-50; column 49, lines 19-43).

Neither Davis nor Srivastava disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes. However, Bielinski discloses disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, paragraphs 1 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 102; paragraph 4, paragraph 1; page 5, paragraphs 3-4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of identifying data schema such as components of value and sub components of value as disclosed by the combination of Davis and Srivastava to adapt the identifying of data schema such as value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the data identifiers described by Davis and Bielinski are useful for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide

meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers, where the received data would need to be identified for storage and manipulation.

Regarding claim 167, Davis discloses wherein at least a portion of the data are obtained from an Internet or an external database (column 8, lines 24-34; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-31).

Claims 64, 69 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Bielinski, and Ray as applied to claim 62 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 64, Davis discloses wherein a plurality of systems are selected from the group consisting of advanced financial systems, basic financial systems and alliance management systems (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 38-53; column 28, lines 31-39; column 44, lines 27-30; column 45, lines 1-50; column 46, lines 27-34; column 49, lines 28-37).

Neither Davis, Bielinski, nor Ray disclose where enterprise related systems are selected from the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses the above mentioned specific enterprise systems, as well as disclosing the receiving of data from a plurality of sources and systems over the Internet. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes

Official Notice that it is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that enterprises could be from any types of organizations as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 69, Davis discloses where the data dictionary defines standard data attributes from the group consisting of components of value, currencies, elements of value, units of measure and time periods (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67).

Neither Davis, Bielinski nor Ray disclose where the data dictionary defines data attributes for account numbers. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known that account numbers are one way of identifying an account and that accounts and account numbers are used in database management and as a way of storing and organizing data and it would be obvious therefore to include account numbers in the data dictionary. Further, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that data could be from any types of indicators as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Regarding claim 91, Davis does not disclose wherein identified changes include the changes as listed in the claim language. However, Bielinski discloses where identified changes include changes to value drivers such as organization equity and production equipment value drivers, employee value drivers (page 2, paragraphs 1, 6, 8; page 5, paragraph 3). Given the combination of Davis and Bielinski as given in claim 62, it would be obvious to use the above changes as each of the changes represents among those things an organization change vary and change in order to see modified financial performance. The motivation in adapting these changes would be that they represent among the common factors that companies can review and consider for modification when a financial performance change is desired or required.

Neither Davis, Bielinski, nor Ray disclose the exhaustive list as disclosed in the claim language. However, it is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore, examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that changes could be from any types of changes as are known to be part of a group in the art as listed in the claim.

Claim 148 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis as applied to claim 145 above, and further in view of Bielinski.

Regarding claim 148, Davis discloses where a common schema identifies data designations selected from the group consisting of components of value, sub

components of value, elements of value and sub elements of value (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-58; column 44, lines 22-34; column 45, lines 40-50; column 49, lines 19-43).

Davis does not disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes. However, Bielinski discloses disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, paragraphs 1 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 102; paragraph 4, paragraph 1; page 5, paragraphs 3-4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of identifying data schema such as components of value and sub components of value as disclosed by Davis to adapt the identifying of data schema such as value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the data identifiers described by Davis and Bielinski are useful for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers, where the received data would need to be identified for storage and manipulation.

Claim 152 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis and Official Notice as applied to claim 150 above, and further in view of Srivastava.



Regarding claim 152, Davis discloses wherein a set of integration and conversion rules are saved in a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45).

Davis does not disclose wherein the set of integration and conversion rules are established using a metadata and conversion rules window. However, Srivastava discloses where the set of integration and conversion rules are established using a metadata and conversion rules window (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Claim 153 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis and Official Notice as applied to claim 150 above, and further in view of Bielinski.

Regarding claim 153, Davis discloses where a common schema identifies data designations selected from the group consisting of components of value, sub

components of value, elements of value and sub elements of value (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-58; column 44, lines 22-34; column 45, lines 40-50; column 49, lines 19-43).

Davis does not disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes. However, Bielinski discloses disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, paragraphs 1 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 102; paragraph 4, paragraph 1; page 5, paragraphs 3-4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of identifying data schema such as components of value and sub components of value as disclosed by Davis to adapt the identifying of data schema such as value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the data identifiers described by Davis and Bielinski are useful for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers, where the received data would need to be identified for storage and manipulation.

Claim 162 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis and Srivastava as applied to claim 159 above, and further in view of Bielinski.

Regarding claim 153, Davis discloses where a common schema identifies data designations selected from the group consisting of components of value, sub components of value, elements of value and sub elements of value (column 8, lines 30-51; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 24-67; column 13, lines 46-49; column 20, lines 32-65; column 25, lines 30-52; column 26, lines 15-25 and lines 34-67; column 29, lines 31-56; column 30, lines 51-58; column 44, lines 22-34; column 45, lines 40-50; column 49, lines 19-43).

Neither Davis nor Srivastava disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes. However, Bielinski discloses disclose identifying known value drivers and non-relevant attributes (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, paragraphs 1 and 8; page 3, paragraphs 102; paragraph 4, paragraph 1; page 5, paragraphs 3-4). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of identifying data schema such as components of value and sub components of value as disclosed by the combination of Davis and Srivastava to adapt the identifying of data schema such as value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski. The motivation would be that all of the data identifiers described by Davis and Bielinski are useful for making evaluations of companies and when financial data is received from multiple external sources as disclosed by Davis, it would be obvious to use the data in order to provide meaningful statistics and data for reviewers and decision makers, where the received data would need to be identified for storage and manipulation.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-52, 62-64, 68-70, 90-91, 134-167 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at 571-272-6702. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jennifer Liversedge/

Examiner, Art Unit 3692